

**U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Kremmling Field Office
P.O. Box 68
Kremmling, CO 80459**

DOCUMENTATION OF LAND USE PLAN CONFORMANCE AND NEPA ADEQUACY

NUMBER: CO-120-2007-18-DNA

PROJECT NAME: Noxious Weed Treatment within the Kremmling Field Office
Pesticide Use Proposals CO-120-2007-01 through 05 (5 total)

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Grand and Jackson Counties

APPLICANT: Grand, Jackson, BLM (Kremmling Field Office) and the Wolford Reservoir Project.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION: The BLM proposes to control noxious weeds throughout the Kremmling Field Office (KFO) in partnership with the above applicants during the 2007 field season. Treatments would occur through the use of the herbicides listed below on the designated weed species in accordance with the Pesticide Use Proposals, labels, and Material Data Safety Sheets (MSDSs). Contact the KFO for more information on the Pesticide Use Proposals. See Attachment #1 for project map and Attachment #2 for stipulations.

Herbicides: Habitat, Arsenal, and Roundup

Weeds: Tamarisk, Cheatgrass and Canada thistle.

LAND USE PLAN (LUP) CONFORMANCE REVIEW: The Proposed Action is subject to the following plan:

Name of Plan: Kremmling Resource Management Plan (RMP), Record of Decision (ROD)

Date Approved: December 19, 1984; Updated February 1999

__X__ The Proposed Action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decisions (objectives, terms, and conditions):

Decision Language: Intensive management of habitats is necessary to assure continued support of the wildlife species dependent upon them for survival (page 9 ROD)

REVIEW OF EXISTING NEPA DOCUMENTS:

List by name and date all existing NEPA documents that cover the Proposed Action.

Name of Document: Noxious Weed Treatment within the Kremmling Resource Area-
BLM CO-018-93-08-EA

Date Approved: 3/4/1993

Name of Document: Environmental Impact Statement Vegetation Treatment on BLM
Lands in Thirteen Western States

Date Approved: 6/5/1991

NEPA Adequacy Criteria	Yes	No
<p>1. Is the Proposed Action substantially the same action and at the site specifically analyzed in an existing document?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explanation of answer: Yes, the Proposed Action is the same action that was analyzed in the 1993 EA. It is also located at the same sites that were specifically analyzed in the EA, which included the entire Kremmling Field Office boundary. 	X	
<p>2. Was a reasonable range of alternatives to the Proposed Action analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s), and does that range and analysis appropriately consider current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explanation of answer: Yes, the 1991 EIS analyzed the alternatives of no use of prescribed burning, no aerial herbicide application, no use of herbicides, and the No Action Alternative. This is a reasonable range of alternatives to the Proposed Action and appropriately considers current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values. 	X	
<p>3. Does the information or circumstances upon which the existing NEPA document(s) are based remain valid and germane to the Proposed Action? Is the analysis still valid in light of new studies or resource assessment information?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explanation of answer: Yes. There is no new information or circumstances that would invalidate the existing analyses. The attachments to the 1993 EA, which included stipulations and maps identifying T&E plants, are still appropriate and are 	X	

included in this DNA as Attachment #2.		
<p>4. Does the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA document(s) continue to be appropriate for the Proposed Action?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explanation of answer: Yes. The 1993 EA analyzed a program for noxious weed control that was weighted towards chemical spraying in an effort to knock down widespread weeds quickly. The 1991 EIS also analyzed methods such as biological controls. Since 1993, methods such as biological controls have been tried but have met with little/no success. Ten years later, annual countywide spraying programs coordinated with other local agencies remain as the most effective deterrent to the spread of these species. 	X	
<p>5. Are the direct and indirect impacts that would result from implementation of the Proposed Action unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explanation of answer: Yes. The 1993 EA referenced the effects analysis presented in the 1991 EIS as applicable for the resource area. This analysis remains valid and impacts are substantially unchanged. 	X	
<p>6. Are the cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the Proposed Action unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explanation of answer: Yes, the cumulative impacts remain unchanged from those analyzed in the 1991 EIS. 	X	
<p>7. Is the public involvement and interagency review associated with the existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the Proposed Action?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explanation of answer: Yes. There have been no additional issues, concerns, or controversies developed since the 1991 EIS and 1993 EA were written. The Proposed Action is listed on the KFO NEPA Register notifying potential interested or affected publics. 	X	

INTERDISCIPLINARY REVIEW:

Name	Title	Area of Responsibility	Date Review Completed
Peter Torma	Rangeland Management Specialist	Range, Weeds, Vegetation, Cultural Resources	2/27/07
Joe Stout	Planning and Environmental	NEPA Compliance	4/20/07

	Coordinator		
Megan McGuire	Wildlife Biologist	Threatened and Endangered Species	2/28/07
Renee Straub	Natural Res. Spec.	Visual Resources	4/18/07

See the 91 EIS and 93EA for a complete list of the original interdisciplinary team member's participating in the preparation of these documents.

REMARKS:

Cultural Resources/Native American Religious Concerns: Since there would little to no ground disturbance, there would be no impacts to cultural resources or Native American Religious Concerns.

Threatened and Endangered Species: The proposed project would not impact Threatened or Endangered Species.

Visual Resource: The proposed project would not affect the visual resources.

MITIGATION: See Attachment #2

NAME OF PREPARER: Peter Torma

NAME OF ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATOR: Joe Stout

DATE: 2/3/06

ATTACHMENTS:

- 1). Map of Proposed Project Area
- 2). 1993 EA Stipulations

CONCLUSION

CO-120-2007-18-DNA

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the land use plan and that the NEPA documentation previously prepared fully covers the Proposed Action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

SIGNATURE OF RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL: /s/ Charles Cesar

DATE SIGNED: 4/23/07

Note: The signed Conclusion on this worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal decision process and does not constitute an appealable decision.